

PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE
STRATEGIC PLAN
FY 2005 THRU FY 2010

MISSION

The mission of the Office of Management & Finance is to provide effective management and support services in an efficient and professional manner to all agencies within Public Safety Services and to public and private entities.

GOALS

- I. To promote efficient, effective results oriented services that will enhance the general management of the Department.
- II. To provide, promote and accelerate the use of technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness.
- III. To improve the quality of Public Safety Services' resources through planning, training & development programs and asset loss prevention.

OBJECTIVE I.1: To increase grant funding by 10% by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY I.1.1 Establish and maintain a Grants Administration function to manage day-to-day activities.

STRATEGY I.1.2 Establish Grants Administration Policies and Procedures that outlines responsibilities and processes for requesting, awarding, implementing, monitoring and management of grants.

STRATEGY I.1.3 Establish manuals and training programs for all Budget Units that may seek grants.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome: Percent of increased State and Federal Grants.

OBJECTIVE I.2: To train 80 percent (80%) of the Department's budget unit heads and their appointed representatives trained and knowledgeable in the budget process by June 30, 2010. (This will allow these individuals to more effectively utilize information provided to them by Budget Services.)

- STRATEGY I.2.1 Designate one employee to coordinate the complex task of training the section heads in the Office of State Police in addition to assisting preparation of OSP's Budget documents.
- STRATEGY I.2.2 Serve as technical advisors to the Deputy Secretary, Undersecretary and Assistant Secretaries and their representatives in the development and monitoring of the Department's operating budget.
- STRATEGY I.2.3 Develop and present short-range and long-range financial plans, documents and instruments to facilitate decision-making within the department in accordance with constitutional and statutory requirements and deadlines.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of budget unit heads and appointed representatives.
 Outcome: Percentage of budget unit heads and appointed representatives trained and knowledgeable in the budget process.

OBJECTIVE I.3: To maintain no higher than a 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2010.

- STRATEGY I.3.1 Work with Civil Service and the State Police Commissions, as well as with other resources, to ensure equity of allocations for all professional and support staff level classifications.
- STRATEGY I.3.2 Provide employee orientation for all new employees to give beneficial information regarding their rights and responsibilities as Public Safety Services employees and to ensure they understand their roles in fulfilling the mission of the organization.
- STRATEGY I.3.3 Expand recruiting activities, maintain recruiting, hiring and retention information of minorities and women in order to lessen any possibilities of discrimination.
- STRATEGY I.3.4 Establish and maintain compensation and pay policies which aid in recruiting and maintaining viable staffing.
- STRATEGY I.3.5 Establish, maintain and implement strong affirmative action, recruiting, classification, compensation, performance management, and an orientation program to attract and retain quality staff.

STRATEGY I.3.6 Implement an entrance and exit interview process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of EEO complaints
Input: Number of Grievances filed
Output: Number of Job Fairs/Career Days attended
Output: Number of applications received in HR from non-PSS employees
Output: Number of employees receiving Outstanding rating
Output: Number of employees receiving Exceeds Requirement rating
Output: Number of employees receiving Meets Requirement rating
Output: Number of employees receiving Needs Improvement rating
Output: Number of employees receiving Poor rating
Outcome: Turnover Rate
Outcome: Attrition Rate

OBJECTIVE I.4: To maintain an error rate no higher than 5% by ensuring employee pay and benefit transactions are accurate and timely by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY I.4.1 Provide an audit function for all employee administration activities in order to catch errors in input prior to payroll being run.

STRATEGY I.4.2 Provide benefits information and updates to all employees through use of the Intranet as well as through employee meetings and classes

STRATEGY I.4.3 Provide training and consultation to agency time administrators in order to ensure that time entry and attendance /leave information is entered and maintained in an accurate manner.

STRATEGY I.4.4 Train, review and validate employee administration activities.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Efficiency: Error Rate

OBJECTIVE I.5: To implement the processing of additional tender types at all fund collection points to include electronic credit and debit options by July 1, 2007.

STRATEGY I.5.1 Attain budget authority to fund bank charges related to acceptance of the additional tender types

STRATEGY I.5.2 Convert and/or add additional capabilities to existing personal computers used to process these transactions

STRATEGY I.5.3 Establish an avenue to process all collections utilizing electronic credit and debit options for the Department.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Output: Number of transactions utilizing credit/debit options

Outcome: Percentage increase in the number of transactions using credit/debit options

OBJECTIVE I.6: To ensure that all deposits are made within one (1) working day of receipt by July 1, 2007.

STRATEGY I.6.1 Identify and implement opportunities that will fully utilize electronic funds transfer capability

STRATEGY I.6.2 Deposit cash and/or checks collected in field offices into their local banks more than once a day or at least daily

STRATEGY I.6.3 Review and update policies on cash management and communicate them to the field offices

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Output: Number of "float" days

Outcome: Percentage of receipts deposited within one day

OBJECTIVE I.7: To ensure that all disbursements are made within 30 days of receipt of the final invoice by July 30, 2007.

STRATEGY I.7.1 Identify and implement opportunities that will fully utilize electronic funds transfer capability

STRATEGY I.7.2 Receive invoices sent to field offices within two weeks of invoice date and make the disbursement within 30 days.

STRATEGY I.7.3 Review and update policies on cash management and communicate them to the field offices

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of collection notices received for invoices past due

Outcome: Percentage of disbursements made with 30 days of invoice date

OBJECTIVE I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and re-deposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| STRATEGY I.8.1 | Utilize State Police Safety Enforcement Unit to collect delinquencies and penalties on warrants of restraint |
| STRATEGY I.8.2 | Develop NSF tracking system that will identify, track, collect and redeposit monies timely and accurately |
| STRATEGY I.8.3 | Pursue inclusion in the District Attorney Association NSF collection efforts |
| STRATEGY I.8.4 | Identify multiple NSF offenders and turn those cases over to the respective District Attorney |
| STRATEGY I.8.5 | Develop guidelines for all offices to follow on what types of negotiable items to accept or not accept |
| STRATEGY I.8.6 | Flag licenses of individuals writing NSF checks for suspension |
| STRATEGY I.8.7 | Place businesses writing NSF checks on the certified funds only list |
| STRATEGY I.8.8 | Use all tools provided by the Legislature in an aggressive collection office to collect monies owed to the Department |

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

| | |
|----------|---|
| Input: | Number of NSF checks received |
| Input: | Percentage of total number of checks returned as NSF |
| Output: | Number of NSF pre-suspension notification letters mailed to individuals |
| Output: | Percentage of notification letters mailed to individuals writing NSF checks |
| Output: | Number of NSF checks collected by DA Association |
| Output: | Percentage of businesses placed on certified funds list |
| Output: | Percentage of OMV offices provided direct access to NSF database |
| Output: | Percentage of NSF checks entered into NSF database |
| Output: | Percentage of licenses flagged |
| Outcome: | Number of vehicle registrations suspended |
| Outcome: | Number of licenses suspended |
| Outcome: | Redeposit rate |
| Outcome: | Percentage reduction in the number of delinquencies |

OBJECTIVE I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

- STRATEGY I.9.1 Implement a Computer Maintenance Management System to serve as a tool for managing the overall maintenance operation and maintenance processes as an internal business and “profit-center” through a deliberate and through implementation process by June 30, 2008.
- STRATEGY I.9.2 Enhance preventative and predicative maintenance (PM/PdM) to automate scheduling of repetitive PM activities with PM tasks and inspection frequencies documented and printed as part of the work order system by June 30, 2008.
- STRATEGY I.9.3 Improve parts and material availability by having the right parts at the right time to provide for effective maintenance planning, increased maintenance customer service and reduce craft and equipment downtime by June 30, 2008.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

- Input: Number of craft personnel
 Number of craft hours available
 Number of work order requests submitted
- Output: Preventative maintenance completion rate
 Number of work order requests completed
 Number of unscheduled work performed
- Outcome: Overall Craft Effectiveness (wrench time)
 Average wrench time (hours per day)
 Percentage of preventative maintenance to corrective maintenance
 Percentage of work orders completed as scheduled
- Efficiency: Average time to complete requested work orders (in days)
 Facility Operating Gross Square Foot (GSF) index
 Number of craft hours gained
 Amount of craft utilization value gained (in dollars)
- Quality: Customer Satisfaction

OBJECTIVE I.10: To have 100% completion of a consolidated or out-sourced Mail Center by June 30, 2010.

- STRATEGY I.10.1 Assess current Department of Public Safety operations and future needs to determine most cost efficient and most effective use of our resources in processing mail.
- STRATEGY I.10.2 Contract with Division of Administration and/or private entity for service.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Output: Number of mailed items metered by DPS Mail Center.

Outcome: Percentage of consolidated or out-sourced center completed.

OBJECTIVE I.11: To have 100% completion of consolidated inventory management system for decentralized inventory operations by June 30, 2009.

STRATEGY I.11.1 Establish a committee to review software programs that can provide a supply requisition system that will be integrated into the central warehouse inventory.

STRATEGY I.11.2 Obtain funding for the software programs by 6/30/05.

STRATEGY I.11.3 Purchase, install, and train personnel on system and implement plan by June 30, 2007.

STRATEGY I.11.4 Provide for a supply requisition and inventory system that through efficient procurement and material management, will provide expeditious delivery of supplies and services to all areas of the Department.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Output: Total number of purchases

Output: Total number of items inventoried

Output: Total number of items issued

Outcome: Percentage of inventory sites completing implementation of new inventory system

OBJECTIVE II.1: To complete 100% of the Active Directory preparation so that other agencies can join the statewide directory service by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY II.1.1 Validate the existing Active Directory configuration and schema.

STRATEGY II.1.2 Implement schema changes relative to hardening/securing the directory service, planning, designing architecture, developing policies and procedures and assisting with the deployment of active directory where required.

STRATEGY II.1.3 Replace all workstation, server and network hardware with devices that are at current technology level.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of OIT required agencies which have been joined to the statewide active directory.

Percentage of the total number of servers joined to the statewide active directory.

Percentage of the total number of workstations joined to the statewide active directory.

Percentage of workstations, servers, routers and switches which have been replaced.

OBJECTIVE II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY II.2.1 Implement 100% of the Reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase II of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by December 1, 2005. Phase II of the NGMV project implements reengineered processes for the issuance of Louisiana Drivers' license/ID cards, Driver Suspension and Reinstatement, Compulsory Insurance Reporting, Controlled Inventory distribution, Revenue Collection, Internet, and Interactive Voice Response Systems.

STRATEGY II.2.2 Implement 100% of the reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase III of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by August 31, 2007. Phase III of the NGMV project Implements reengineered processes for Louisiana Vehicle Registration and Titling, International Registration Plan, and integrates these processes with the core system components implemented during Phase II of the project.

STRATEGY II.2.3 Implement 100% of the reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase IV of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by June 30, 2010. Phase IV of the NGMV project Implements reengineered processes for automated Drivers' License testing at all OMV field office locations, automated customer queuing at all OMV field office locations, and Computer Based Training for all OMV employees.

STRATEGY II.2.4 Retrain Information Technology support staff in the tools and technologies needed to support the reengineered OMV

functions (see STRATEGY II.2.1, II.2.2, II.2.3) by June 30, 2008.

STRATEGY II.2.5 Create and deploy a single sign on solution for the Office of Motor Vehicle employees by December 31, 2005.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase II.

Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase III.

Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase IV.

Percentage of OMV employees using single sign on.

Percentage of IT OMV support staff retrained.

OBJECTIVE II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY II.3.1 Move all State Police imaging management and workflow applications from Imageplus to Content Manager by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY II.3.2 To implement the Video Gaming Monitoring System upgrade by June 30, 2007.

STRATEGY II.3.3 To implement the Integrated Gaming System by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY II.3.4 To implement the rewrite of the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system by June 30, 2008 to support new requirements, functionalities and features required by or in use by federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies.

STRATEGY II.3.5 To implement 100% of the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) upgrade by June 30, 2008.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of latent cases being electronically reported and tracked.

Percentage of gaming related auditing, accounting, and licensing systems unified.

Percentage of capabilities supported by new CCH system.

Percentage of AFIS workstations upgraded/replaced to support OmniTrak.

Percentage of systems migrated from Imageplus.

OBJECTIVE II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

- STRATEGY II.4.1 100% implementation of statewide digital network using 700 MHz technology for voice communication that can be utilized by emergency services agencies by June 30, 2008. Migrate users from the present 800 MHz system to the 700 / 800 MHz to be completed by 2008.
- STRATEGY II.4.2 To implement mobile data speeds capable of supporting mug shots and finger print image by June 30, 2008.
- STRATEGY II.4.3 Provide broad band communications utilizing 4.9 GHz public safety frequency band for voice, data and video in selected areas (hot spots), mainly in major metropolitan areas to be used by emergency services agencies by June 30, 2009.
- STRATEGY II.4.4 Provide 100 % emergency first responders with information access for voice, data and images during emergencies and disaster situations on an incremental basis to be completed statewide by June 30, 2009.
- STRATEGY II.4.5 Utilize available State owned fiber where available and private fiber in remaining locations to link wireless sites and provide large bandwidth and reliability.
- STRATEGY II.4.6 Maintain the present statewide 800 MHz network through June 30, 2008 so that the agencies utilizing this system can migrate to digital technology in an orderly manner.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of digital repeaters installed statewide.

Percentage of radios and mobile data computers installed.

Percentage of agencies migrated to third digital system.

Percentage of applications used by emergency field personnel.

Percentage of broadband hot spots installed around the state.

Percentage of State owned fiber used in the statewide network.

OBJECTIVE II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

- STRATEGY II.5.1 To replace the applications server hardware and software with more efficient, faster, and current technology by June 30, 2007.
- STRATEGY II.5.2 To migrate the DICRS OS/2 Formatted Optical Platters to more efficient WORM media by June 30, 2010.
- STRATEGY II.5.3 To consolidate single application servers with locally attached storage to a few large servers, which support multiple applications per server with storage, provided by a Storage Area Network (SAN) by June 30, 2010.
- STRATEGY II.5.4 To complete the upgrade of the Data Center electrical, cooling and fire suppression infrastructure all by June 30, 2007. This includes upgrading workstations to Cat 6 wiring, new wiring for work cubicles, chillers and air conditioners replaced/upgraded, fire suppression systems upgraded/replaced, redundant UPS installed and replace old generator.
- STRATEGY II.5.5 To complete the establishment of a remote location for automated disaster recovery backups by June 30, 2009.
- STRATEGY II.5.6 Implement backup SAN to provide disaster recovery for DPS Data Center SAN by June 30, 2010.
- STRATEGY II.5.7 Convert existing Optical Disk WORM information to more efficient newer WORM tape technology by June 30, 2010.
- STRATEGY II.5.8 Implement automation tools for Operations and Data Control to enhance computer room productivity and efficiency by automation of 80% of manual functions by June 30, 2010.
- STRATEGY II.5.9 To fully participate in a state wide disaster recovery site by June 30, 2010.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of applications servers replaced.

Percentage of applications servers moved to large application servers.

Percentage of backup sets being written to offsite libraries.

Percentage of DICRS OS/2 Optical disk requiring conversion to more efficient WORM media converted.

Percentage of Optical disk converted.

Percentage of workstations and servers utilizing SAN .

Percentage of manual operations performed by Data Control and Operations which were automated.

Percentage of electrical, cooling and fire suppression infrastructure components installed, upgraded or replaced.

Percentage of participation in state wide disaster recovery site.

OBJECTIVE II.6: To totally migrate off the UNISYS mainframe in order to stop paying high maintenance fees on an obsolete processing environment and to add the flexibility of open systems, including credit card payments, by June 30, 2010

STRATEGY II.6.1 Remove 100% of all existing MAPPER applications from the UNISYS mainframe by migrating systems to current server technologies using approved applications software tools and methods by June 30, 2010

STRATEGY II.6.2 Accept credit/debit card payment of fees owed for Office of Motor Vehicles driver's licensing, vehicle registration, and reinstatement services, Fire Marshal, and Tier 2 applications by July 1, 2007.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Outcome:

Percentage of systems migrated from MAPPER.

Percentage of applications allowing credit/debit card payments.

OBJECTIVE III.1: To conduct internal, compliance and performance audits in order to identify deficiencies and to correct 95% of the identified deficiencies by June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY III.1.1 Increase audit staff by 7 to allow for a more comprehensive audit staff that will be proactive instead of reactive

STRATEGY III.1.2 Increase the number of internal audits performed to include audits of the Department's performance indicators to ensure validity and accuracy

STRATEGY III.1.3 Conduct Department-wide internal controls assessment and involve Legislative Audit team in the planning process.

STRATEGY III.1.4 Promote professional certification requirements for staff auditors.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number internal, compliance and performance audits performed

Output: Number of deficiencies identified

Outcome: Percentage of deficiencies corrected

OBJECTIVE III.2: To pass 100% of the State Loss Prevention audit by maintaining a safe and violence free workplace by implementing and maintaining policies and provide on-going training to assure a safe working environment through June 30, 2010.

STRATEGY III.2.1 Reassess safety training requirements and requirements of violence-free workplace.

STRATEGY III.2.2 Appoint assessment committee to determine needs, physical cost training needs and responsibility.

STRATEGY III.2.3 Obtain funding for physical modifications and training aids.

STRATEGY III 2.4 Implement plan.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of employees in Department.

Output: Number of employees receiving safety training.

Number of employees receiving violence in the workplace training.

Outcome: Savings Department-wide from successful completion of the audit

Office of Management and Finance

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.1: To increase grant funding by 10% by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percent of increased State and Federal Grants

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** A centralized grants administration program will drive a coordinated effort to secure additional and/or larger sources of grant funding.
3. **Use:** Will be used for internal management and performance based budgeting.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: I.S.I.S. Federal Aid Expenditure Summary Report (2G42)
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation – Percent of increase in total Federal Dollars.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** Limitations include: Recurring Vs/ Non-Re-recurring Grant Awards. Federal Grants are contingent on Federal Budgets.
10. **Responsible Person:** Kay F. DeBenedetto, Grants Administrator, Manager, Financial Services Division; 225-925-6041; 225-925-3973 (fax); kdebened@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.2: To train 80% of the Department's budget unit heads and their appointed representatives trained and knowledgeable in the budget process by June 30, 2010. (This will allow these individuals to more effectively utilize information provided to them by Budget Services.)

Indicator Name: Number of budget unit heads and appointed representatives

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To ensure that 80% of the Department's budget unit heads and their appointed representatives are trained and knowledgeable in the budget process.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Department Table of Organization
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation; count the number of budget unit heads on the department's table of organization and add the number of appointed representatives.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Paula B. Tregre, Budget Administrator
225.925.6031; 225.925.6889 (fax); ptregre@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.2: To train 80% of the Department's budget unit heads and their appointed representatives trained and knowledgeable in the budget process by June 30, 2010. (This will allow these individuals to more effectively utilize information provided to them by Budget Services.)

Indicator Name: Percentage of Departmental budget unit heads and appointed representatives trained and knowledgeable in the budget process.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Key
2. **Rationale:** To ensure that 80% of the Department's budget unit heads and their appointed representatives are trained and knowledgeable in the budget process.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a manual tracking system - it is only as reliable as the person maintaining it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Budget Training Internal Tracking System
Collection: Quarterly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation; count the number of budget unit heads on the department's table of organization and add the number of appointed representatives. Divide the number trained by the total number of budget unit heads and appointed representatives possible.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Paula B. Tregre, Budget Administrator
225.925.6031; 225.925.6889 (fax); ptregre@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Number of EEO Complaints

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** HR directs the departmental EEO Program. This includes gathering information and preparing replies to EEOC interrogatories and court subpoenas received as a result of discrimination charges filed against the Department.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used as a gauge to determine organizational climate at the senior management level. Less complaints of EEO violation will indicate a healthy organization.
4. **Clarity:** EEO is defined as Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** EEO complaints are tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Number of Grievances Filed

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** HR directs the Employee Relations Program. This includes oversight of disciplinary policy and procedures for compliance with Civil Service Rules and requirements, departmental grievance procedures for compliance, managing and directing the departmental Performance Appraisal Program. We are also required to update the Departmental Affirmative Action Program and supervise the collection, maintenance, and preparation of statistical data required under the collection, maintenance, and preparation of statistical data required under the format and guidelines established by EEOC and the Department of Civil Service.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used as a gauge to determine organizational climate at the senior management level. Less grievance complaints will indicate a healthy organization.
4. **Clarity:** ERP is defined as Employee Grievance Procedure. EEOC is defined as Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. AAP is defined as the Affirmative Action Plan.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities. Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Grievances are tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Number of Job Fairs/Career Days Attended

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resources Management Program has a myriad of activities not specifically assigned but implied and essential to the proper selection and placement of employees and recruit shortages within State Police.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of budget unit heads to identify quality candidates for state employment in difficult to fill positions requiring specialization.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resources Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities. Collection: Semi-annually;
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Job Fairs/Career Days attended are tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Number of applications received in HR from non-PSS employees

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resources Management Program manages and coordinates the processing of all personnel actions and forms. HR also directs the departmental employment program including the review and giving of final approval to all requests to fill positions.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of the HR Director 5 (Director) to group activities and organize them to accomplish specific customer focused programs. This will provide the HR Director 5 the information required to accurately develop throughput, based on turnaround time required for the customer.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resources Management Program. PSS is defined as Public Safety Services.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of applications received in HR from non-PSS employees is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Number of Employees Receiving Outstanding Ratings

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resources Management Program manages and assists in directing the department Performance Appraisal Program.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of senior management to gauge the performance of employees. This will also aid in identifying individuals that qualify for the department employee recognition program.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resources Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of Employees Receiving Outstanding Ratings is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Attrition Rate

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Key
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) directs the department's classification program including reviewing, analyzing and the development of all position descriptions for new positions, reallocations and updates. The HRMP also audits established positions to determine if current position descriptions accurately and adequately describe the levels and types of duties performed.
3. **Use:** This will provide indicators for management in developing facts to assist in problem-solving alternatives aimed at decreasing attrition. It will also provide the ability to recommend solutions for upgrading pay, positions duties perform, reallocations, and to improve the employee training and staff development programs within the department.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resources Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Attrition is calculated as the total number of retirements divided by the average number of employees employed by Public Safety.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: The number of employees receiving exceeds requirement ratings

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program manages and assists in directing the department Performance Appraisal Program.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of the senior management to gauge the performance of employees. Statistical information will provide for the analysis of: performance accountability, identifying the benefits, planning for performance, coaching good performers, analyzing performance problems to improve employees, documented counseling.
4. **Clarity:** EEO is defined as Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resources Management Program.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of employees receiving exceeds requirement ratings is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: The number of employees receiving meets requirement ratings

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program manages and assists in directing the department Performance Appraisal Program.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of the senior management to gauge the performance of employees. Statistical information will provide for the analysis of: performance accountability, identifying the benefits, planning for performance, coaching good performers, analyzing performance problems to improve employees, documented counseling.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resource Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of employees receiving meets requirement ratings is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: The number of employees receiving needs improvement ratings

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program manages and assists in directing the department Performance Appraisal Program.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of the senior management to gauge the performance of employees. Statistical information will provide for the analysis of: performance accountability, identifying the benefits, planning for performance, coaching good performers, analyzing performance problems to improve employees, and documented counseling.
4. **Clarity:** EEO is defined as Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of employees receiving needs improvement ratings is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: The number of employees receiving poor ratings

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program manages and assists in directing the department Performance Appraisal Program.
3. **Use:** This indicator will enhance the ability of the senior management to gauge the performance of employees. Statistical information will provide for the analysis of: performance accountability, identifying the benefits, planning for performance, coaching good performers, analyzing performance problems to improve employees, and documented counseling.
4. **Clarity:** EEO is defined as Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of employees receiving poor ratings is tracked by the Human Resources Office throughout the year. This calculation is just a count of the total number of these.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.3: To maintain no higher than 10% attrition rate for authorized T.O. across Public Safety Services by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Turnover Rate

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Key
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program directs the department's classification program including reviewing, analyzing and the development of all position descriptions for new positions, reallocations and updates. The HRMP also audits established positions to determine if current position descriptions accurately and adequately describe the levels and types of duties performed.
3. **Use:** This will provide indicators for management in developing facts to assist in problem-solving alternatives aimed at decreasing turnover. It will also provide the ability to recommend solutions for upgrading pay, positions duties performed, reallocations, and to improve the employee training and staff development programs within the department.
4. **Clarity:** HRMP is defined as the Human Resource Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Human Resource (HR) mission directed based on Human Resources Management Program (HRMP) activities.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Turnover rate is calculated as the total number of separations divided by average number of employees employed by Public Safety.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.4: To maintain an error rate no higher than 5% by ensuring employee pay and benefits are accurate and timely by June 30, 2006.

Indicator Name: Error Rate

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Efficiency; Key
2. **Rationale:** The Human Resource Management Program directs the department's bi-weekly payroll function for the employees of Public Safety Services and directs the benefits program by supervising the enrollment of employees. Quality is defined by efficient and effective services. Effectiveness is providing the services that the customer values, i.e., pay and benefits.
3. **Use:** Information will be used in determining customer satisfaction rate based on request for services and independent HR Customer Surveys. Data will provide a key indicator for training field payroll personnel on specific performance requirements to meet employee satisfaction.
4. **Clarity:** Efficiency is defined as the amount of resources used to accomplish the service. HRMP is defined as the Human Resource Management Program.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is reliable and documented in the job analyses of the HR Director, HR Manager 4, and the HR Manager 3 position descriptions.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: The HR Manager 3 (Administrative Operations) is responsible for collection with supervisory oversight by the HR Manager 4.
Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Error rate is calculated as the total number of errors divided by the total number of actions processed.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Tina M. Boudreaux, Human Resources Director
225.925.6067; 225.925.3970 (fax); tboudrea@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.5: To implement the processing of additional tender types at all fund collection points to include electronic credit and debit options by July 1, 2007.

Indicator: Number of transactions utilizing credit/debit options

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Maximize the number of on-line electronic transactions to increase efficiency and customer service.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a DPS internal database that tracks online Driver's License and Vehicle Registration renewals and an external database (Louisiana E-Mall) which will track online ODR or fleet renewals in addition to Driver's License and Vehicle Registration renewals.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number of transactions for Fiscal Year.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.5: To implement the processing of additional tender types at all fund collection points to include electronic credit and debit options by July 1, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage increase in the number of transactions using credit/debit options

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Maximize the number of on-line electronic transactions to increase efficiency and customer service.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a DPS internal database that tracks online Driver's License and Vehicle Registration renewals and an external database (Louisiana E-Mall) which will track online ODR or fleet renewals in addition to Driver's License and Vehicle Registration renewals.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of transactions increased for FY 01 to FY 02 divided by the total number of transactions for FY 02.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.6: To ensure that all deposits are made within one (1) working day of receipt by July 1, 2007.

Indicator: Number of Float Days (timeframe for bank #1 to receive cash value of checks, etc. from bank #2)

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Monitor the deposit timeline to ensure compliance of cash management policies.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a special report generated by DPS Data Processing that indicates float dollars and float days.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of direct deposits made for one day divided by the number of total deposits that should have been made for that day.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has some weaknesses due to the number of float days could increase or decrease for open banking days.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.6: To ensure that all deposits are made within one (1) working day of receipt by July 1, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of receipts deposited within one day.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Monitor the deposit timeline to ensure compliance of cash management policies.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a special report generated by DPS Data Processing that indicates float dollars and float days.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of direct deposits made for one day divided by the number of total deposit that should have been made for that day.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.7: To ensure that all disbursements are made within 30 days of receipt of the final invoice by July 30, 2007.

Indicator: Number of collections notices received for invoices past due.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Monitor the timeliness of the payment to vendors for invoices submitted to ensure that there are no additional costs related to the expenditure.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a Business Objects report extracted from ISIS.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Business Objects Report
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Monthly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Utilizing the Business Objects report, take the date the invoice was paid less the date of the invoice to determine those greater than 30 days.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.7: To ensure that all disbursements are made within 30 days of receipt of the final invoice by July 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of disbursements made within 30 days of invoice date.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Monitor the timeliness of the payment to vendors for invoices submitted to ensure that there are no additional costs related to the expenditure.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be a Business Objects report extracted from ISIS.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** **Source:** Business Objects Report
Collection: Fiscal Year end; **Reporting:** Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Utilizing the Business Objects report, take the date the invoice was paid less the date of the invoice to determine those greater than 30 days.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Number of NSF checks received.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10652

1. **Type and Level:** Input; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Monitor total number of returned checks for the department.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be an internal Lotus Notes Database. It is only as reliable as the employees maintaining the database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Daily; Reporting: Fiscal Year End
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Utilizing the NSF Lotus Notes Database a case number is assigned to each returned check as it is entered into the Database. Take the last case number for FY 02 less the last case number for FY 01.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of total number of checks returned NSF.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Income; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Monitor returned checks patterns and number of checks.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. Since implementation of direct deposits, we are unable to accurately determine the number of checks received by the department.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Not available
Collection: Not available; Reporting: Not available
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of NSF checks received in current fiscal year divided by the total number of checks received by the department for the same period of time.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has weaknesses and limitations because of direct deposits not having accurate total number of checks deposited.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee; Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Number of NSF pre-suspension notification letters mailed to individuals.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10654

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF checks returned have pre-suspension notification letter sent.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data is the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number is compiled continuously in the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no weaknesses and limitations.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of notification letters mailed to individuals writing NSF checks.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF checks returned have notification letter sent.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data is the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** One hundred percent are verified within the NSF Lotus Notes Database by reviewing status categories in the database.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no weaknesses and limitations.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2006.

Indicator: Percentage of businesses placed on certified funds list.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Monitor and ensure all businesses are placed on certified funds that are warranted.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data is the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of businesses indicated as certified funds divided by total number of businesses in the database.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has weaknesses due to the need to manually count to produce statistics and therefore; human error potential at this time.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of OMV offices provided direct access to NSF database.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify all personnel have access to NSF Lotus Notes database.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is the Data Processing Center report –identifying the number of offices that have access to NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Data Processing Center
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number of OMV offices with access to the NSF Lotus Notes Database divided by the total number of OMV offices.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of NSF checks entered into NSF database.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF offenders have been entered into the Lotus Notes NSF database.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data is the NSF Lotus Notes database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of NSF's entered into the database for a given period of time divided by the total number of NSF checks received for the same period.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no weaknesses and limitations.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage of licenses flagged

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome, Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF offenders that have not paid within 30 days driver's licenses are flagged for suspension.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data is a report processed by the department's Data Center identifying the number of licenses flagged.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: DPS Report
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The department maintains a report which gives the number of licenses flagged for a period of time divided by the total number of NSF's.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no weaknesses or limitations.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Number of vehicle registrations suspended

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10655

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF offenders that have not paid within 30 days vehicle registrations are flagged for suspension.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. There is no mechanism to determine the vehicle registration at this time that would have to be suspended in these cases. We are currently only suspending driver's license for the check signer.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** N/A
8. **Scope:** N/A
9. **Caveats:** There is no mechanism to determine the vehicle registration at this time that would have to be suspended in these cases. We are currently only suspending driver's license for the check signer.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Number of licenses suspended

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all NSF offenders that have not paid within 30 days driver's licenses are flagged for suspension.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: DPS Report
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Data processing maintains a report that can give the number of licenses suspended for a given period. A license is suspended when payment is not received within 30 days from issuance of notification.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Redeposit rate

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Verify that all payments for NSF checks are redeposited into the Treasurer's Bank.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source is maintained in the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The amount of payments received divided by the total amount of NSF checks.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.8: To reduce the number of delinquencies due to Non Sufficient Funds by 30% and maximize the accuracy of collection and redeposit rate up to 90% by June 30, 2007.

Indicator: Percentage reduction in the number of delinquencies

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To determine that the number of NSF checks received by the department is decreasing.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has been audited by the Legislative Auditor. The source of this data will be the NSF Lotus Notes Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: NSF Lotus Notes Database
Collection: Fiscal Year end; Reporting: Fiscal Year end
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number and amount of NSF checks for the prior fiscal year less the number of and amount of NSF checks for the current fiscal year.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** This indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Sandra P. Lee, Fiscal Operations Manager
225-925-6279; 225-925-4990 (fax); slee@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of craft personnel

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of staffing provided to responsibility of the facilities' capital assets. The indicator is expressed in the total number of T.O. and job appointments assigned to Facility Services.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing appropriated level of staffing to required and assigned responsibilities of Facility Services. Additionally, data will be used to calculate Overall Craft Utilization and Average Wrench Time.
4. **Clarity:** Facility Services Table of Organization.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** HR ISIS; Collection – data available real-time. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of craft hours available

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of service being provided to maintain the responsibility of the facilities' capital assets. The indicator is expressed in the total numbers of hours annually worked by Facility Service employees. Hours are only those assessed toward assigned projects or hands-on time and does not include travel time, procurement time or other administrative time.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing actual hands-on work time to determine what efforts can be made to assist overall efficiency and effectiveness. Additionally, data will be used to calculate Overall Craft Utilization and Average Wrench Time.
4. **Clarity:** Craft hours will be maintained by each tradesman and will be submitted as part of their completed work orders. These craft hours will only reflect hands-on or wrench time for a particular project. The time will not reflect travel time, administrative time or time required to procure supplies or order materials.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – data available real-time. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator, 225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of work order request submitted

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of work required to maintain DPS' facilities capital assets. The indicator is expressed in the total number of work requests submitted to Facility Services.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing appropriated level of staffing required to effectively manage the assigned responsibilities of Facility Services. Additionally, data will be used to calculate Overall Craft Utilization and Average Wrench Time.
4. **Clarity:** The various sections of DPS submitted a work request every time maintenance is needed to be performed. Additionally, the Planner/Estimator will created work requests for all scheduled preventative maintenance. Combined with other information, this indicator begins to tell the story of the overall craft utilization of the Office of Facility Services.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – data available real-time. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Preventative Maintenance Completion Rate

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of at which preventative maintenance work requests are being completed. Industry standards hold that preventative maintenance is the key to any successful maintenance program and should be the top priority because you are essentially preventing things from breaking and causing service downtime.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing whether preventative maintenance is actually being accomplished at the scheduled time.
4. **Clarity:** Preventative maintenance schedules are derived from manufactures' operating equipment manuals and are entered into CMMS. When maintenance is needed, CMMS notifies the appropriated personnel and the work is scheduled for completion. This process ensures the preventative maintenance is not forgotten or placed on the backburner.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quarterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of work order requests completed

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of at which preventative and corrective maintenance work requests are being completed.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing the rate at which requests are being completed.
4. **Clarity:** Work requests with uncompleted status can be assess as to why the work has yet to be performed and courses of actions can be put into place to successively complete the work request.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quarterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of unscheduled work performed

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of at which unscheduled maintenance arises and must be performed.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing the rate at which unscheduled work requests are being completed.
4. **Clarity:** Due to the nature of maintenance, all work cannot be scheduled. Emergencies and other “must-do now” things frequently occur. In order to appropriately track all maintenance, this indicator will give Facility Services a sense of what things require immediate attention. This will allow adjustments to preventative maintenance and other operating procedures to reduce unscheduled maintenance.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quaterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Overall Craft Effectiveness

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Quality; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the combination of Craft Utilization, Craft Performance and Craft Service Quality to measure house maintenance operation.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for measuring and improving overall craft effectiveness.
4. **Clarity:** 1. Craft Utilization or Pure Wrench Time (CU) – measuring how effective we are in planning and scheduling craft resources so that these assets are doing value-added, productive work (wrench time). Effective planning/scheduling within a proactive maintenance process is key to increased wrench time and craft utilization. 2. Craft Performance (CP) – how efficient we are in actually doing hands-on craft work when compared to an established planned time or performance standard. Directly related to the level of individual craft skills and overall trades experience as well as the personal motivation and effort of each crafts person or crew. Effective craft skills training and technical development contribute to a high level of craft performance. 3. Craft Service Quality (CSQ) – quality of actual work, where certain jobs possibly require a call back to the initial repair thus requiring another trip to fix it right the second time. However, Craft Service Quality can be negatively impacted due to no fault of the crafts person when hasty repairs, patch jobs or inferior repair parts/materials create the need for a call back.
5. **Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – Daily; Reporting – Annually; State Fiscal Year at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Overall Craft Effectiveness = Craft Utilization X Craft Performance X Craft Service Quality.
8. **Scope:** It is the sum of smaller parts.
9. **Caveats:** N/A
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator, 225-925-7936 Fax 225-925-1872, jim.karr@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Average Wrench Time (hours per day)

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Quality; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents Craft Utilization or pure wrench time (productive work).
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for measuring average wrench time, and improving wrench time use.
4. **Clarity:** 1. Craft Utilization or Pure Wrench Time (CU) – measuring how effective we are in planning and scheduling craft resources so that these assets are doing value-added, productive work (wrench time). Effective planning/scheduling within a proactive maintenance process is key to increased wrench time and craft utilization.
5. **Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – Daily; Reporting – Annually; State Fiscal Year at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Craft Utilization = $\frac{\text{Total Productive (Wrench Time)}}{\text{Total Craft Hours Available \& Paid}} \times 100$
8. **Scope:** It is the sum of smaller parts.
9. **Caveats:** N/A
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936 Fax 225-925-1872, jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Percentage of preventative maintenance v. corrective maintenance

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of at which preventative maintenance is being performed as compared to corrective maintenance.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing the level of at which preventative maintenance is being performed as compared to corrective maintenance.
4. **Clarity:** Industry best practices hold that a maintenance organization's workload should be a mix of 80% preventative maintenance to 20% corrective maintenance. This indicator will help us make the appropriate adjustment to get to that industry standard; thereby, extending the normal life of our facilities and equipment and maximizing our investment.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quaterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Percentage of work orders completed as scheduled

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of at which maintenance is being performed in the time stated.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing the timeliness of scheduled maintenance requests.
4. **Clarity:** In order to improve Overall Craft Effectiveness, maintenance must be completed in a timely manner. This indicator will help us measure the amount of time it takes to completed scheduled work request; thereby improving customer satisfaction.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quarterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Average time to complete requested work orders (in days)

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Efficiency; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the average amount of time it takes Facility Service to complete work orders.
3. **Use:** This indicator will assist internal management in assessing the time it takes to complete an average work order.
4. **Clarity:** Part of our customer service initiative is responsiveness. Response time is a direct correlation to the number of craft personnel, the number of work orders submitted and the number of unscheduled maintenance requiring attention. By establishing time standards, we can respond to the customer more quickly.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** CMMS; Collection – quarterly. Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not applicable
8. **Scope:** Direct data pull.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; FAX 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Facility Operating Gross Square Foot (GSF) Index

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Efficiency; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the level of funding provided for the stewardship responsibility of the facilities' capital assets. The indicator is expressed as a ratio of annual facility maintenance operating expenditure to the facilities' gross square feet (GSF).
3. **Use:** CMMS and ISIS; Internal management purposes. This indicator represents the level of funding provided for the stewardship responsibility of the facilities of DPS and can be used to compare our costs with industry benchmarks.
4. **Clarity:** Annual Facility Maintenance Operating Expenditures Defined: Annual Facility Maintenance Operating Expenditures includes all expenditures to provide service and routine maintenance related to facilities and grounds used for E&G purposes. It also includes expenditures for major maintenance funded by the Annual Facilities Maintenance Operating Budget. . This category does not include expenditures for major maintenance and/or capital renewal funded by other institutional accounts, nor does it include expenditures for utilities and institutional support services such as mail, telecommunications, public safety, security, motor pool, parking, environmental health and safety, central receiving, etc. Gross Square Feet Defined: Gross Square Footage (GSF): Is the cumulative total of the institution's (educational and general) space on all floors of the building. Traditionally computed as the length times (X's) the width using the outside façade of the exterior walls. Excluding the auxiliary enterprise square footage areas.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – quarterly basis; Reporting – annual basis; Using State Fiscal Year, at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Annual Facility Maintenance Operating Expenditures (\$) divided by Gross Square Feet (GSF)
8. **Scope:** Sum of smaller part.
9. **Caveats:** No.
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936 FAX; 225-925-1872; jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Number of Craft Hours Gained

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Quality; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the gaining of craft hours by proper planning and scheduling.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for measuring and increasing craft hour efficiency.
4. **Clarity:** 1. Craft Utilization or Pure Wrench Time (CU) – measuring how effective we are in planning and scheduling craft resources so that these assets are doing value-added, productive work (wrench time). Effective planning/scheduling within a proactive maintenance process is key to increased wrench time and craft utilization.
5. **Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – Daily; Reporting – Annually; State Fiscal Year at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not Applicable
8. **Scope:** It is the sum of smaller parts.
9. **Caveats:** N/A
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; Fax 225-925-1872, jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Amount of Craft Utilization Value Gained (In Dollars)

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Quality; GPI
2. **Rationale:** This indicator represents the gained value in dollar amounts for a number of positions.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for measuring and improving overall craft value gained in dollar amounts.
4. **Clarity:** 1. Craft Utilization or Pure Wrench Time (CU) – measuring how effective we are in planning and scheduling craft resources so that these assets are doing value-added, productive work (wrench time). Effective planning/scheduling within a proactive maintenance process is key to increased wrench time and craft utilization.
5. **Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – Daily; Reporting – Annually; State Fiscal Year at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Not Applicable
8. **Scope:** It is the sum of smaller parts.
9. **Caveats:** N/A
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; Fax 225-925-1872, jim.karr@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.9: To increase overall craft utilization (wrench time) to a minimum of 50% or 4 hours per day of hands on maintenance by June 30, 2008.

Indicator Name: Customer Satisfaction

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Quality; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Customer satisfaction information is key knowledge and a critical success factor. This particular index shows the blend of delighted to dissatisfied customers. It is the statistic that higher management expects to see and the index most used in strategic planning and goal setting. Its strength is that it is a concise summary of all responses. Its weakness is that it communicates less about the nature of satisfaction than other indices. The average score does not represent any one person or group within the whole. It is not as useful an index as others for understanding the dynamics of satisfaction. It does not forecast what future satisfaction levels may be without intervention. The component parts that construct this overall average need to be understood in order to build an effective action plan for improvement. Therefore, the Customer Satisfaction index needs to be used in conjunction with one or more other indices.
3. **Use:** Customer Satisfaction surveys. The indicator will be used in determining efficiency and quality of service we provide compared to industry benchmarks.
4. **Clarity:** Customer Satisfaction Index Defined: This index is the overall average of all responses made by all survey respondents. It is most accurate to calculate the average by summing the value of all responses and dividing the sum by the number of responses. It is less accurate to calculate the figure by striking intermediary averages, e.g., the average by survey form, summing the intermediary averages and dividing by their number to arrive at an overall average.
5. **Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy:** No.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal Database; Collection – Daily; Reporting – Annually; State Fiscal Year at the end of each quarter.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total of ranking points divided by the Total number of survey answers.
8. **Scope:** It is the sum of smaller parts.
9. **Caveats:** N/A
10. **Responsible Person:** James Karr, Planner/Estimator
225-925-7936; Fax 225-925-1872, jim.karr@dps.state.la.us.

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.10: To have 100% completion of a consolidated or out-sourced Mail Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of mailed items metered by DPS Mail Center

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** In an effort to consolidate operations it is necessary to determine the number of mail pieces being metered by DPS personnel.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is audited periodically by the Legislative Auditor. Postage Mail Machine counters cannot be adjusted manually.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Pitney Bowes Mailing Equipment; Collection: Daily; Reporting: Monthly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculation utilizing postage meter count.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Lora Robertson, Office Manager
225.925.7032; 225.925.7255 (fax); lrobertson@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.10: To have 100% completion of a consolidated or out-sourced Mail Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of consolidated or out-sourced center completed.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Needed to determine the percentage of completion of a consolidated or out-sourced Mail Center.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is not audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal Sources;
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculations provided by dividing the out-sourced processed postage documents by the total processed postage documents.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Lora Robertson, Office Manager
225.925.7032; 225.925.7255 (fax); lrobertson@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.11: To have 100% completion of consolidated inventory management system for decentralized inventory operations by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Total number of purchases

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To decentralize inventory operations it is necessary to determine the number of inventory purchases required to provide delivery of supplies statewide.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is audited periodically by the Legislative Auditor. ISIS/AGPS Internal database records the number of inventory purchases made.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: ISIS/AGPS database records
Collection: Continually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculation provided by automated system.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Danny Taylor, Warehouse Supervisor
225.925.3933; 225.925.7255 (fax); dtaylor@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.11: To have 100% completion of consolidated inventory management system for decentralized inventory operations by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Total number of items inventoried

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To decentralize inventory operations it is necessary to determine the number of items inventoried.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is audited periodically by the Legislative Auditor. Internal DPS database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS Database; Collection: Continually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculation provided by automated system.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Danny Taylor, Warehouse Supervisor
225.925.3933; 225.925.7255 (fax); dtaylor@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.11: To have 100% completion of consolidated inventory management system for decentralized inventory operations by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Total number of items issued

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To decentralize inventory operations it is necessary to determine the number of items issued.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is audited periodically by the Legislative Auditor. Internal DPS Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS Database; Collection: Continually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculation provided by automated system.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Danny Taylor, Warehouse Supervisor
225.925.3933; 225.925.7255 (fax); dtaylor@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective I.11: To have 100% completion of consolidated inventory management system for decentralized inventory operations by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of inventory sites completing implementation of new inventory system

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; GPI
2. **Rationale:** To implement a consolidated inventory system for decentralized inventory sites it is necessary to determine the percentage of sites completing implementation process.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator is not audited by the Legislative Auditor. Internal DPS Database.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal DPS Database; Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard numeric calculation provided by dividing the number of inventory locations implemented by the number of inventory locations requiring implementation.
8. **Scope:** Aggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Danny Taylor, Warehouse Supervisor
225.925.3933; 225.925.7255 (fax); dtaylor@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective II.1: To complete 100% of the Active Directory preparation so that other agencies can join the statewide directory service by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of OIT required agencies, which have been joined to the statewide Active Directory.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To express the number of agencies that have joined Active Directory as a percentage of the total number of agencies required to join.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured. .
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: LA.GOV. Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** (Number of Agencies joined/Number of Agencies required to join)100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dennis Weber, IT Technical Support Manager
225.925.6226, 225.926.4019 dweber@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective II.1: To complete 100% of the Active Directory preparation so that other agencies can join the statewide directory service by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of the total number of servers joined to the statewide active directory.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To express the number of servers that have been joined to Active Directory as a percentage of the total number of servers required to join.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured. .
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: LA.GOV. Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** (Number of Agencies joined/Number of Agencies required to join)100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dennis Weber, IT Technical Support Manager
225.925.6226, 225.925-.4019, dweber@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective II.1: To complete 100% of the Active Directory preparation so that other agencies can join the statewide directory service by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of the total number of workstations joined to the statewide active directory.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To express the number of workstations that have been joined to Active Directory as a percentage of the total number of workstations required to join.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured. .
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: LA.GOV. Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** (Number of Agencies joined/Number of Agencies required to join)100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dennis Weber, IT Technical Support Manager
225.925.6226, 225.925-.4019, dweber@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance

Objective II.1: To complete 100% of the Active Directory preparation so that other agencies can join the statewide directory service by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of workstations, servers, routers and switches which have been replaced.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To express the number of workstations, servers, routers and switches replaced annually as a percentage of the total number of each requiring replacement.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for both internal management purposes and performance based budgeting purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured. Number of workstations, servers, routers and switches requiring replacement is defined as those pieces of equipment no longer under warranty.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Hardware Purchase Orders, Inventory
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** (Replacement PCs installed/PCs to be replaced)100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dennis Weber, IT Technical Support Manager
225.925.6226, 225.925.4019, dweber@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase II.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Percentage measure of number of processes implemented
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** The Office of Motor Vehicles has undertaken the reengineering of all of their business processes both automated and manual. This is a multi phase project which requires a redesign and rewrite of all existing computerized processes. Phase I was the reengineering plan document. Phase II is the deployment of all reengineered processes for Drivers License related functions. Phase III is the deployment of all Vehicle related functions and Phase IV is the deployment and integration all field offices and training related functions.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data is only as reliable as the Phase I planning document. As processes are deployed the number will be tallied and checked against the initial plan for accuracy.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: (Phase II number of processes implemented / number of Phase II processes to be implemented) * 100
Collection: As processes are deployed a spreadsheet of these processes will be updated.
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Manual
8. **Scope:** aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jack Green, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4020, 225.925.4019(fax), jgreen@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase III.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Percentage measure of number of processes implemented
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** The Office of Motor Vehicles has undertaken the reengineering of all of their business processes both automated and manual. This is a multi phase project which requires a redesign and rewrite of all existing computerized processes. Phase I was the reengineering plan document. Phase II is the deployment of all reengineered processes for Drivers License related functions. Phase III is the deployment of all Vehicle related functions and Phase IV is the deployment and integration all field offices and training related functions.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data is only as reliable as the Phase I planning document. As processes are deployed the number will be tallied and checked against the initial plan for accuracy.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: (Phase III number of processes implemented / number of Phase III processes to be implemented) * 100
Collection: As processes are deployed a spreadsheet of these processes will be updated.
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Manual
8. **Scope:** aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jack Green, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4020, 225.925.4019(fax), jgreen@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of reengineered processes implemented for NGMV Phase IV.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Percentage measure of number of processes implemented
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** The Office of Motor Vehicles has undertaken the reengineering of all of their business processes both automated and manual. This is a multi phase project which requires a redesign and rewrite of all existing computerized processes. Phase I was the reengineering plan document. Phase II is the deployment of all reengineered processes for Drivers License related functions. Phase III is the deployment of all Vehicle related functions and Phase IV is the deployment and integration all field offices and training related functions.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data is only as reliable as the Phase I planning document. As processes are deployed the number will be tallied and checked against the initial plan for accuracy.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: (Phase IV number of processes implemented / number of Phase IV processes to be implemented) * 100
Collection: As processes are deployed a spreadsheet of these processes will be updated.
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Manual
8. **Scope:** aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jack Green, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4020, 225.925.4019(fax), jgreen@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of OMV employees using single sign on

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Baseline measurement for percentage of OMV employees using single sign on.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used identify the total percentage of employees that use the single sign solution.
4. **Clarity:** Currently OMV employees must sign on to multiple systems and remember passwords for each of the systems. The single sign on process will allow this to be accomplished in one easy process and eliminate the need for multiple passwords.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data is very valid, reliable, and accurate. It will be gathered from system sign on statistics.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Gathered from the systems logs.
Collection: As users are implemented a spreadsheet will be updated with current information.
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Manual
8. **Scope:** aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jack Green, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4020, 225.925.4019(fax), jgreen@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.2: To bring to 100% completion, the Office of Motor Vehicle reengineering project to make the office more efficient, user friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of IT OMV support staff retrained.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** It is used to track progress toward retraining OMV IT support staff.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes in computing percentage retrained to track progress toward retraining OMV IT support staff and will help determine the money to be allocated in the budget for education and training..
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: IT Organizational Chart and Training Records of Staff
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Manual computation; Percentage of IT OMV support staff retrained = (Number of IT OMV support staff retrained / Number of IT OMV support staff requiring training) * 100
8. **Scope:** Neither.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Frank Mixon, IT Application Manager
225.925.6226, Fax 225.925.4019, FMixon@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of latent cases being electronically reported and tracked

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track rate of latent case submission
3. **Use:** Provide a latent fingerprint case management solution for the full function remote locations support the Louisiana Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS).
4. **Clarity:** Latent case – A fingerprint images retrieved from a crime scene used for investigative, evidence, or identification purposes. Full Function Remote Location – one of six locations throughout the state that provided technical fingerprint analysis support to the state's criminal justice committee.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Total number of latent cases entered into the automated tracking and reporting system
Collection: Monthly
Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** (Number of latent cases electronically entered into the automated tracking and reporting system divided by the total number of latent cases) times 100
8. **Scope:** Aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** John Aranyosi, IT Management Consultant
225.925.6546, 225.925.4019, jaranyosi@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of gaming related auditing, accounting, and licensing systems unified.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track progress toward unifying gaming systems
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal Table of Gaming Related Systems. Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Percentage of gaming related auditing, accounting, and licensing systems unified = (Number of gaming related auditing, accounting, and licensing systems integrated into a unified system / Initial number of gaming related auditing, accounting, and licensing systems) * 100
8. **Scope:** Neither.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Frank Mixon, IT Application Manager
225.925.6226, Fax 225.925.4019, FMixon@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of capabilities supported by new CCH system

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track the rate capabilities are being moved to the new computerized criminal history system
3. **Use:** Rewrite the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) application to support new requirements, functionality, and features of the criminal justice community.
4. **Clarity:** CCH – Computerized Criminal History
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Hand count of Number of new capabilities implemented; hand count of Number of capabilities to be implemented
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of new capabilities implemented/Number of capabilities to be implemented *100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** John Aranyosi, IT Management Consultant
225.925.6546, 225.925.4019, jaranyosi@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of AFIS workstations upgraded/replaced to support OmniTrak

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track the rate that AFIS workstations are upgraded/ replaced to latest technology
3. **Use:** Upgrade Statewide AFIS to latest fingerprint Technology (OmniTrak).
4. **Clarity:** AFIS – Automated Fingerprint Identification System; AFIS workstation – A workstation specifically configured to capture, retrieve, and/or process images and related demographic information from the State’s AFIS Database to create, process, display and/or print an criminal arrest or applicant processing for the purposes of obtaining a positive identification of an individual. OmniTrak – The latest fingerprint technology.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Hand count of Number of AFIS workstations upgraded; hand count of Number of AFIS workstations
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of AFIS workstations upgraded/Number of AFIS workstations *100
8. **Scope:** Aggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** John Aranyosi, IT Management Consultant
225.925.6546, 225.925.4019, jaranyosi@dps.la.gov

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.3: To complete 100% of the upgrade efforts on image management, gaming and criminal history in order to make the Office of State Police more efficient, user-friendly, customer-centric, adaptable, open to rapid application development, and to provide them with the most current and effective technologies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of systems migrated from ImagePlus

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track progress of the move from ImagePlus to Content Manager
3. **Use:** Internal management - To track progress on replacement of the IMAGEPLUS systems
4. **Clarity:** IMAGEPLUS is an obsolete proprietary image management and workflow system Content Manager is a current open image management and workflow system.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Hand count of applications in ImagePlus. Hand count of applications in Content Manager.
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Percentage of systems migrated from ImagePlus = $(\text{Number of applications in Content Manager} / \text{number of applications originally in ImagePlus}) * 100$
8. **Scope:** Neither aggregate nor disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Rick Carr, Applications Programming Manager,
225.925.6242; 225.925.4019 (fax); rcarr@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of digital repeaters installed statewide.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** New Digital Repeaters will have to replace the existing analog repeaters.
3. **Use:** To be used with the 700MHz system
4. **Clarity:** 700MHz Radio System
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Documentation of each existing and future repeaters will be maintained.
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database collection
8. **Scope:** Replace existing 800MHz Communications repeaters with 700MHz digital repeaters.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of radios and mobile data computers installed

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** New Digital radios and Mobile Data equipment will have to be installed to unitize the new 700 MHz communications system.
3. **Use:** To be used with the 700MHz system
4. **Clarity:** 700MHz Radio System
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Documentation of each existing and future radios and mobile data equipment will be maintained .
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database collection
8. **Scope:** Replace existing 800MHz radios and mobile data equipment with 700 MHz equipment.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of agencies migrated to third digital system

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome
2. **Rationale:** More agencies will want to participate in a faster more robust and interoperable ready Communications System.
3. **Use:** To be used with the 700MHz system
4. **Clarity:** 700MHz Radio System
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: A Database is kept of and for each agency that participates in the Communications System.
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database collection
8. **Scope:** Replace existing 800MHz system with a faster more up to date system allowing more Agencies to participate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of applications used by emergency field personnel.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** During emergencies, crisis response, and Amber alerts users will be able to utilize more robust applications in the field.
3. **Use:** To be used with the 700MHz Communications system
4. **Clarity:** 700MHz Radio Communications System
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Documentation / Data Base will be maintained for all activities transferred over the system.
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database/documentation collection
8. **Scope:** To build a State Wide communications system that will accommodate faster, more efficient data transfer speeds while upgraded Computers to accommodate more robust applications.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of broadband hot spots installed around the state.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** During emergencies, crisis response, and Amber alerts users will be able to upload and download images at faster speeds utilizing the 4.9 GHz hot spot system installed around the state. Users will also be able to download updates from these areas.
3. **Use:** To be used with the 4.9 GHz Hot Spot Communication System
4. **Clarity:** 4.9 GHz Hot Spot Communication System
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Documentation / Data Base will be maintained for all activities transferred over 4.9 GHz Hot Spot Communication System.
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database/documentation collection
8. **Scope:** To build a 4.9 GHz Hot Spot Communication System in metropolitan areas that will accommodate faster, more efficient data transfer speeds.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.4: To complete 100% of the move to a complete digital network that can be utilized by all emergency services agencies utilizing digital technology and IP standards to provide true interoperability for voice, data and images by June 30, 2009.

Indicator Name: Percentage of State owned fiber used in the statewide network.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** By unitizing the State owned Fiber Network we can create larger bandwidth as well as increased reliability to remote wireless communication sites.
3. **Use:** To be used with the State owned Fiber Network, 700 MHz communications system and 4.9 GHz hot spot system.
4. **Clarity:** State owned Fiber Network
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Documentation / Data Base will be maintained for all activities transferred over State owned Fiber Network.
Collection: Monthly; Reporting: Quarterly
7. **Calculation Methodology:** through database/documentation collection
8. **Scope:** Utilize available State owned fiber where available and private fiber in remaining locations to link wireless sites and provide large bandwidth and reliability.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jeya Selvaratnam, Deputy Director, Communications
225.925.9036, jselvara@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of applications servers replaced.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track rate of replacement.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to track progress on server replacement. It will also assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** Applications Server: A computer which runs the programs supporting a particular system (i.e. Driver License Photo, Criminal History, etc). Then indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable as the information entered into the system and the person maintaining it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Department Inventory Files, Purchase Orders and Receiving Reports
Collection: As Purchase Orders are issued and equipment received
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of servers replaced or upgraded/number of servers supported*100. When purchased these items come with a three year warranty. Also, server hardware and software generally becomes obsolete and expensive if not impossible to maintain after three years. Therefore, it is our policy to replace these items every three years.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of applications servers moved to large application servers

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track progress on servers being moved to large multiple application servers.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to track progress on server consolidation. It will also assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** Applications Server: A computer which runs the programs supporting a particular system (i.e. Driver License Photo, Criminal History, etc). Large Multiple Applications Server: An applications server normally supports a single application. Large Multiple Applications Servers support more than a single application. Then indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Department Inventory Files, and technical configuration files
Collection: As servers are moved to multiple application servers
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Count of servers moved/count of servers needing to be moved*100. Where possible, it is more efficient and cost effective to purchase a larger server and have it support multiple applications. In doing this, you gain efficiencies such as reduced floor space and fewer Operating Systems to support.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of backup sets being written to offsite libraries.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track rate of systems being backed up to offsite libraries.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** Disaster Backup: This is a copy of files that will be required to restore computer operations in the event of a disaster. Then indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured. Then indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:**
Source: Department Disaster Recovery Plan, Inventory Files, and technical configuration files. Collection: As systems are converted to use offsite libraries for backups.
Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Count of systems being backed up to offsite libraries /Count of systems needing to backed up to offsite libraries *100.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of DICRS OS/2 Optical disk requiring conversion to more efficient WORM media converted.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track the rate of DICRS OS/2 Formatted Optical files moved to DICRS OS 390 WORM media files.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** Optical Disk: Media used for storing large amounts of data which can be accessed online. WORM: Stands for Write Once Read Many. Cannot be altered which meets legal requirements.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: DICRS and OS/390 Optical Log files
Collection: As platters are moved from DICRS to OS/390; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Count of DICRS OS 390 WORM files/Count of DICRS OS/2 formatted Optical Disk files*100. DICRS OS2 Optical Platters are obsolete and unsupported. They must be moved to OS390 media to receive support.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director
225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of Optical disk converted.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track the progress of converting WORM Optical DISK to other more efficient WORM technology
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** Optical Disk: Media used for storing large amounts of data which can be accessed online. WORM: Stands for Write Once Read Many. Cannot be altered which meets legal requirements.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: WORM Optical Log files and Other WORM log files. Collection: As Optical DISK files are moved to other WORM technology files. Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Count of other WORM technology files/count of WORM Optical Disk files*100. Optical DISK technology will be obsolete and unsupported in the next few years. Data residing on this media must be moved to a supported media.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of workstations and servers using SAN.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track the progress of converting workstations and servers to using SAN storage.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** SAN: Storage Area Network is a consolidation of shared disk for use by workstations and servers. Simplifies the management and disaster recovery of data.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Count of the number of servers and workstations that can use SAN. Collection: As devices are set up to use the SAN. Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Count of devices using SAN / count of SAN candidate devices * 100.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of manual operations performed by Data Control and Operations which were automated.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track the number of production jobs that previously required manual review by Data Control which were automated to require no manual review as an indicator of automation in Data Control and Operations.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** This indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable as the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Computer generated lists of automated production jobs. Collection: As production jobs are added to the system Reporting: Semi-annually.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of production jobs requiring no review / Total number of production jobs * 100.
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not 100% accurate. There are some functions that may be automated that will not be reflected in number of production jobs in the system. Also, there may be some manual work required by either operations or production control even though it requires no manual review of the job.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of electrical, cooling and fire suppression infrastructure components installed, upgraded or replaced .

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track the rate upgrading the electrical, cooling and fire suppression infrastructure.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** This indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Architectural drawing of infrastructure components in the Data Center; Collection: As components are upgraded; Reporting: Semi-annually.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of components upgraded / Total Number of components * 100
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.5: To complete 100% of the effort to provide the Department with a tier one Data Center by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of participation in state wide disaster recovery site.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** Track the number of systems participating in the state disaster recovery backup site.
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used internally to assist in management decision making on determining resource requirements and cost projections.
4. **Clarity:** This indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This data has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor. This data is only as reliable the person maintaining and interpreting it.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Disaster recovery plan, disaster recovery data backups. Collection: As new systems are migrated to use the backup site; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** $\text{Number of systems participating in disaster recovery} / \text{Number of systems requiring disaster recovery} * 100$
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Dick McDonald, Information Services Deputy Director, 225.925.4778, 225.925.4019(fax), dmcdonal@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.6: To totally migrate off the UNISYS mainframe in order to stop paying high maintenance fees on an obsolete processing environment and to add the flexibility of open systems, including credit card payments, by June 30, 2010

Indicator Name: Percentage of systems migrated from Mapper

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track progress of the consolidation efforts
3. **Use:** Internal management - To track progress on replacement of the MAPPER systems.
4. **Clarity:** MAPPER is an obsolete fourth generation language in which the department is no longer developing systems
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Hand count of systems requiring migration. Hand count of systems migrated.
Collection: Annually; Reporting: Annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Percentage of systems migrated from Mapper = $(\text{Number of systems migrated} / \text{number of system needing to be migrated}) * 100$
8. **Scope:** Neither aggregate nor disaggregate
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Rick Carr, Applications Programming Manager
225.925.6242; 225.925.4019 (fax); rcarr@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management & Finance

Objective II.6: To totally migrate off the UNISYS mainframe in order to stop paying high maintenance fees on an obsolete processing environment and to add the flexibility of open systems, including credit card payments, by June 30, 2010

Indicator Name: Percentage of applications allowing credit/debit card payments.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Supporting
2. **Rationale:** To track progress of the effort to allow payment of fees by credit/debit cards
3. **Use:** This indicator will be used for internal management purposes.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** This indicator has not been audited by the Legislative Auditor.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal Table of Applications Collecting Fees. Collection: Semi-annually; Reporting: Semi-annually
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Percentage of applications allowing credit/debit card payments = (Number of applications programmed adapted to process credit/debt card payments / Number of applications needing to process credit/debt card payments) * 100
8. **Scope:** Neither.
9. **Caveats:** The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.
10. **Responsible Person:** Frank Mixon, IT Application Manager
225.925.6226, Fax 225.925.4019, FMixon@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective III.1: To conduct internal, compliance and performance audits in order to identify deficiencies and to correct 95% of the identified deficiencies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of internal, compliance and performance audits performed

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6593

1. **Type and Level:** Input; Key
2. **Rationale:** Measures the number of internal, compliance and performance audits performed by Audit Services personnel.
3. **Use:** Federally and state mandated compliance to laws, policies and procedures, etc. in adherence to internal, compliance and performance auditing functions which include safeguarding of assets, prescribed methods of internal controls, recommendations of policies and procedures within the agency.
4. **Clarity:** Not applicable
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** Valid, reliable, and accurate based on hard count of audits performed.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: Internal databases generated in Audit Services. Collection: Ongoing basis; Reporting: Quarterly basis
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Calculation: Numeric hard count of audits performed. Methodology: Standard calculation
8. **Scope:** Aggregate, a sum of smaller parts
9. **Caveats:** Not applicable
10. **Responsible Person:** Denise A. Autin, Auditor Supervisor, Audit Services
225-925-4471; 225-922-0699 (fax); dautin@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective III.1: To conduct internal, compliance and performance audits in order to identify deficiencies and to correct 95% of the identified deficiencies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of deficiencies identified

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6594

1. **Type and Level:** Output, Key
2. **Rationale:** Measures the performance of the auditee.
3. **Use:** Determine auditee's compliance to identified deficiencies which may affect the audit program, audit procedures and processes used during an audit.
4. **Clarity:** Not applicable
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** External source based on the auditee's methods of work and overall work performed.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: External source based on the auditee. Collection: Ongoing basis; Reporting: Quarterly basis
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Calculation: Contingent on the performance of the auditee as to whether or not in compliance to prescribed law, policies, procedures, accounting methods, etc. Methodology: Non standard calculation
8. **Scope:** Aggregate, a sum of smaller parts
9. **Caveats:** Indicator limited to auditee's practices to prescribed law, policies and procedures, accounting methods, internal controls in place, etc.
10. **Responsible Person:** Denise A. Autin, Auditor Supervisor, Audit Services
225-925-4471; 225-922-0699 (fax); dautin@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet

Program: Management and Finance

Objective III.1: To conduct internal, compliance and performance audits in order to identify deficiencies and to correct 95% of the identified deficiencies by June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Percentage of deficiencies corrected

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6595

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Key
2. **Rationale:** Measures the compliance to audit findings and recommendations made to auditee.
3. **Use:** Determine auditee's compliance to identified deficiencies which may affect the audit program, audit procedures and processes used during an audit.
4. **Clarity:** Not applicable
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** External source determined by the auditee. There could be built-in bias present in some instances based on auditee's interpretation of deficiencies identified, etc. which may require a re-audit.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Source: External source determined by the auditee. Collection: Ongoing basis; Reporting: Quarterly basis
7. **Calculation Methodology:** Calculation: Contingent on the performance of the auditee as to whether or not in compliance to prescribed law, policies, procedures, accounting methods, etc. Methodology: Non standard calculation
8. **Scope:** Disaggregate, a part of a larger whole.
9. **Caveats:** Indicator limited to auditee's response of corrective actions of the deficiencies identified are corrected. (i.e., a time frame is set up for compliance at a later date which is non compliance).
10. **Responsible Person:** Denise A. Autin, Auditor Supervisor, Audit Services
225-925-4471; 225-922-0699 (fax); dautin@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance Program

Objective III.2: To pass 100% of the State Loss Prevention audit by maintaining a safe and violence free workplace by implementing and maintaining policies and provide on-going training to assure a safe working environment through June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of employees in the Department

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Passing the State Loss Prevention audit requires that all employees participate in the safety program. Therefore the number of employees in the Department determines the numbers that are required to be tracked.
3. **Use:** The indicator will provide raw data to be reconciled with the numbers and names of those participants.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator is clear. The State Loss Prevention program is a function of the Division of Administration.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** The number of employees for the Department is a function of DPS Human Resources.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Human Resource personnel are responsible for accurately report the number of employees.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The methodology is standard in that it is used for statistical statewide information for the budget in the Total Organization for the state and for payroll information for employee remuneration.
8. **Scope:** The scope is a part of a larger whole.
9. **Caveats:** There are no caveats.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jesse Davis, Administrator, Operational Support
(225) 922-1462; (225) 925-7567; jdavis@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance Program

Objective III.2: To pass 100% of the State Loss Prevention audit by maintaining a safe and violence free workplace by implementing and maintaining policies and provide on-going training to assure a safe working environment through June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of employees receiving safety training

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Input; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Passing the State Loss Prevention audit requires that all employees participate in the safety program. Therefore the number of employees receiving safety training determines the numbers that are participating in the program.
3. **Use:** The indicator will provide raw data to be reconciled with the numbers and names of total employees.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator is clear. The State Loss Prevention program is a function of the Division of Administration.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** The number of employees receiving safety training is a function of the various DPS safety coordinators throughout the state.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Safety coordinators are responsible for collecting data on safety training. They report this information to the Safety Director for collection and reporting.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The methodology is not standard.
8. **Scope:** The scope is a part of a larger whole.
9. **Caveats:** There are no caveats.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jesse Davis, Administrator, Operational Support
(225) 922-1462; (225) 925-7567; jdavis@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance Program

Objective III.2: To pass 100% of the State Loss Prevention audit by maintaining a safe and violence free workplace by implementing and maintaining policies and provide on-going training to assure a safe working environment through June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Number of employees receiving violence in the workplace training

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level:** Output; GPI
2. **Rationale:** Passing the State Loss Prevention audit requires that all employees participate in the violence in the workplace training program. Therefore the number of employees receiving this training determines the numbers that are participating in the program.
3. **Use:** The indicator will provide raw data to be reconciled with the numbers and names of total employees.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator is clear. The State Loss Prevention program is a function of the Division of Administration.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** The number of employees receiving violence in the workplace training is a function of the various DPS safety coordinators throughout the state.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Safety coordinators are responsible for collecting data on this training. They report this information to the Safety Director for collection and reporting.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The methodology is not standard.
8. **Scope:** The scope is a part of a larger whole.
9. **Caveats:** There are no caveats.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jesse Davis, Administrator, Operational Support
(225) 922-1462; (225) 925-7567; jdavis@dps.state.la.us

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Management and Finance Program

Objective III.2: To pass 100% of the State Loss Prevention audit by maintaining a safe and violence free workplace by implementing and maintaining policies and provide on-going training to assure a safe working environment through June 30, 2010.

Indicator Name: Savings Department-wide from successful completion of the audit.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10479

1. **Type and Level:** Outcome; Key
2. **Rationale:** Passing the State Loss Prevention audit requires that all employees participate. The Office of Risk Management monitors and reports on various aspects of the Loss Prevention Program. 100% pass provides a refund on insurance payments.
3. **Use:** The indicator will provide management with funding availability for these rebates.
4. **Clarity:** The indicator is clear. The State Loss Prevention program is a function of the Division of Administration.
5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** The number audits performed is a function of the Office of Risk Management and is assisted by the various DPS safety coordinators throughout the state.
6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Safety coordinators are responsible for collecting data for these audits. They are assisted in meeting the requirements of the program by the DPS Safety Director.
7. **Calculation Methodology:** The methodology is not standard.
8. **Scope:** The scope is a part of a larger whole.
9. **Caveats:** There are no caveats.
10. **Responsible Person:** Jesse Davis, Administrator, Operational Support
(225) 922-1462; (225) 925-7567; jdavis@dps.state.la.us

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.1.1. Establish and maintain a Grants Administration function to manage day-to-day activities.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.1.2. Establish Grants Administration Policies and Procedures that outlines responsibilities and processes for requesting, awarding, implementing, monitoring and management of grants.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.1.3. Establish manuals and training programs for all Budget Units that may seek grants.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.2.1. Designate one employee to coordinate the complex task of training the section heads in the Office of State Police in addition to assisting preparation of OSP's Budget documents.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.2.2. Serve as technical advisors to the Deputy Secretary, Undersecretary and Assistant Secretaries and their representatives in the development and monitoring of the Department's operating budget.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing
 New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.2.3. Develop and present short-range and long-range financial plans, documents and instruments to facilitate decision-making within the department in accordance with constitutional and statutory requirements and deadlines.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.1. Work with Civil Service and the State Police Commissions, as well as with other resources, to ensure equity of allocations for all professional and support staff level classifications.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing
 New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.2. Provide employee orientation for all new employees to give beneficial information regarding their rights and responsibilities as Public Safety Services employees and to ensure they understand their roles in fulfilling the mission of the organization.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted

 x Other analysis used

 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists

 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified

 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing

 New, startup date estimated

 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget

 Impact on capital outlay

 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.3. Expand recruiting activities, maintain recruiting, hiring and retention information of minorities and women in order to lessen any possibilities of discrimination.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.4. Establish and maintain compensation and pay policies which aid in recruiting and maintaining viable staffing.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.5. Establish, maintain and implement strong affirmative action, recruiting, classification, compensation, performance management, and an orientation program to attract and retain quality staff.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.3.6. Implement an entrance and exit interview process.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.4.1. Provide an audit function for all employee administration activities in order to catch errors in input prior to payroll being run.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.4.2. Provide benefits information and updates to all employees through use of the Intranet as well as through employee meetings and classes.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.4.3. Provide training and consultation to agency time administrators in order to ensure that time entry and attendance/leave information is entered and maintained in an accurate manner.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.4.4. Train, review and validate employee administration.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.5.1. Attain budget authority to fund bank charges related to acceptance of the additional tender types.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.5.2. Convert and/or add additional capabilities to existing personal computers used to process these transactions.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.5.3. Establish an avenue to process all collections utilizing electronic credit and debit options for the Department.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.6.1. Identify and implement opportunities that will fully utilize electronic funds transfer capability.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.6.2. Deposit cash and/or checks collected in field offices into their local banks more than once a day or at least daily.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.6.3. Review and update policies on cash management and communicate them to the field offices.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.7.1. Identify and implement opportunities that will fully utilize electronic funds transfer capability.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.7.2. Receive invoices sent to field offices within two weeks of invoice date and make the disbursement within 30 days.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.7.3. Review and update policies on cash management and communicate them to the field offices.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.1. Utilize State Police Safety Enforcement Unit to collect delinquencies and penalties on warrants of restraint.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.2. Develop NSF tracking system that will identify, track, collect and redeposit monies timely and accurately.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.3. Pursue inclusion in the District Attorney Association NSF collection efforts.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.4. Identify multiple NSF offenders and turn those cases over to the respective District Attorney.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.5. Develop guidelines for all offices to follow on what types of negotiable items to accept or not accept.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.6. Flag licenses of individuals writing NSF checks for suspension.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing
 New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.7. Place businesses writing NSF checks on the certified funds only list.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.8.8. Use all tools provided by the Legislature in an aggressive collection office to collect monies owed to the Department.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.9.1. Implement a Computer Maintenance Management System to serve as a tool for managing the overall maintenance operation and maintenance processes as an internal business and “profit-center” through a deliberate and thorough implementation process by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted

 x Other analysis used

 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists

 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified

 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing

 x New, startup date estimated

 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget

 Impact on capital outlay

 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.9.2. Enhance preventative and predicative maintenance (PM/PdM) to automate scheduling of repetitive PM activities with PM tasks and inspection frequencies documented and printed as part of the work order system by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing
 New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.9.3. Improve parts and material availability by having the right parts at the right time to provide for effective maintenance planning, increased maintenance customer service and reduce craft and equipment downtime by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 x Already ongoing
 New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.10.1. Assess current Department of Public Safety operations and future needs to determine most cost efficient and most effective use of our resources in processing mail.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.10.2. Contract with Division of Administration and/or private entity for service.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.11.1. Establish a committee to review software programs that can provide a supply requisition system that will be integrated into the central warehouse inventory.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.11.2. Obtain funding for the software programs by 6/30/05.

 x Analysis

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.11.3. Purchase, install and train personnel on system and implement plan by June 30, 2007.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY I.11.4. Provide for a supply requisition and inventory system that through efficient procurement and material management, will provide expeditious delivery of supplies and services to all areas of the Department.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.1.1 Validate the existing Active Directory configuration and schema.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.1.2 Implement schema changes relative to hardening/securing the directory service, planning, designing architecture, developing policies and procedures and assisting with the deployment of active directory where required.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.1.3 Replace all workstation, server and network hardware with devices that are at current technology level.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.2.1 Implement 100% of the Reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase II of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by December 1, 2005. Phase II of the NGMV project implements reengineered processes for the issuance of Louisiana Drivers' license/ID cards, Driver Suspension and Reinstatement, Compulsory Insurance Reporting, Controlled Inventory distribution, Revenue Collection, Internet, and Interactive Voice Response Systems.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.2.2 Implement 100% of the reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase III of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by August 31, 2007. Phase III of the NGMV project Implements reengineered processes for Louisiana Vehicle Registration and Titling, International Registration Plan, and integrates these processes with the core system components implemented during Phase II of the project.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.2.3 Implement 100% of the reengineered office procedures and automation for Phase IV of the Next Generation Motor Vehicle project for the Office of Motor Vehicles by June 30, 2010. Phase IV of the NGMV project Implements reengineered processes for automated Drivers' License testing at all OMV field office locations, automated customer queuing at all OMV field office locations, and Computer Based Training for all OMV employees.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.2.4 Retrain Information Technology support staff in the tools and technologies needed to support the reengineered OMV functions (see STRATEGY II.2.1, II.2.2, II.2.3) by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.2.5 Create and deploy a single sign on solution for the Office of Motor Vehicle employees by December 31, 2005.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.3.1 Move all State Police imaging management and workflow applications from Imageplus to Content Manager by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.3.2 To implement the Video Gaming Monitoring System upgrade by June 30, 2007.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.3.3 To implement 100% of the Integrated Gaming System by June 30, 2006.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.3.4 To implement the rewrite of the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system by June 30, 2008 to support new requirements, functionalities and features required by or in use by federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.3.5 To implement 100% of the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) upgrade by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.1 100% implementation of statewide digital network using 700 MHz technology for voice communication that can be utilized by emergency services agencies by June 30, 2008. Migrate users from the present 800 MHz system to the 700 / 800 MHz to be completed by 2008.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.2 To implement mobile data speeds capable of supporting mug shots and finger print image by June 30, 2008.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.3 Provide broad band communications utilizing 4.9 GHz public safety frequency band for voice, data and video in selected areas (hot spots), mainly in major metropolitan areas to be used by emergency services agencies by June 30, 2009.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.4 Provide 100 % emergency first responders with information access for voice, data and images during emergencies and disaster situations on an incremental basis to be completed statewide by June 30, 2009.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.5 Utilize available State owned fiber where available and private fiber in remaining locations to link wireless sites and provide large bandwidth and reliability.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.4.6 Maintain the present statewide 800 MHz network through June 30, 2008 so that the agencies utilizing this system can migrate to digital technology in an orderly manner.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.1 To replace 100% of the applications server hardware and software with more efficient, faster, and current technology on a three-year cycle by June 30, 2007.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.2 To migrate 100% of the DICRS OS/2 Formatted Optical Platters to more efficient WORM media by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.3 To consolidate 100% of single application servers with locally attached storage to a few large servers, which support multiple applications per server with storage, provided by a Storage Area Network (SAN) by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.4 To complete the upgrade of the Data Center electrical, cooling and fire suppression infrastructure all by June 30, 2007. This includes upgrading workstations to Cat 6 wiring, new wiring for work cubicles, chillers and air conditioners replaced/upgraded, fire suppression systems upgraded/replaced, redundant UPS installed and replace old generator.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.5 To complete the establishment of a remote location for automated disaster recovery backups by June 30, 2009.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.6 Implement backup SAN to provide 100% disaster recovery for DPS Data Center SAN by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.7 Convert existing Optical Disk WORM information to more efficient newer WORM tape technology by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.8 Implement automation tools for Operations and Data Control to enhance computer room productivity and efficiency by automation of 80% of manual functions by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.5.9 To fully participate in a state wide disaster recovery site by June 30, 2010.

 x Analysis

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.6.1 Remove 100% of all existing MAPPER applications from the UNISYS mainframe by migrating systems to current server technologies using approved applications software tools and methods by June 30, 2010

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY II.6.2 Accept credit/debit card payment of fees owed for Office of Motor Vehicles driver's licensing, vehicle registration, and reinstatement services, Fire Marshal, and Tier 2 applications by July 1, 2007.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.1.1. Increase audit staff by 7 to allow for a more comprehensive audit staff that will be proactive instead of reactive.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.1.2. Increase the number of internal controls performed to include audits of the Department's performance indicators to ensure validity and accuracy.

 x Analysis

 Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 x Other analysis used
 x Impact on other strategies considered

 x Authorization

 x Authorization exists
 Authorization needed

 x Organization Capacity

 Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 x Resource needs identified

 x Time Frame

 Already ongoing
 x New, startup date estimated
 Lifetime of strategy identified

 x Fiscal Impact

 x Impact on operating budget
 Impact on capital outlay
 x Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.1.3. Conduct Department-wide internal controls assessment and involve Legislative Audit team in the planning process.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.1.4. Promote professional certification requirements for staff auditors.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.2.1. Reassess safety training requirements and requirements of violence-free workplace.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.2.2. Appoint assessment committee to determine needs, physical cost training needs and responsibility.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.2.3. Obtain funding for physical modifications and training aids.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

STRATEGY III.2.4. Implement plan.

 x Analysis

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Cost/benefit analysis conducted |
| <u> x </u> | Other analysis used |
| <u> x </u> | Impact on other strategies considered |

 x Authorization

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Authorization exists |
| <u> </u> | Authorization needed |

 x Organization Capacity

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <u> </u> | Needed structural or procedural changes identified |
| <u> x </u> | Resource needs identified |

 x Time Frame

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> | Already ongoing |
| <u> x </u> | New, startup date estimated |
| <u> </u> | Lifetime of strategy identified |

 x Fiscal Impact

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u> x </u> | Impact on operating budget |
| <u> </u> | Impact on capital outlay |
| <u> x </u> | Means of finance identified |

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT & FINANCE
STRATEGIC PLAN
2006 – 2010
APPENDIX

1. The principal clients and users of the Office of Management & Finance are all of the agencies within Public Safety Services as well as our employees. We provide services in the areas of human resources, information services, accounting, budget, procurement, grants & contract management, management & program analysis, planning, record retention, safety, and buildings & grounds maintenance. We also support other state agencies through information services in addition to local law enforcement and the Division of Administration. Other clients include the public, federal and local government, insurance industry, financial institutions, regulatory bodies, and vendors.
2. Potential external factors that are beyond our control that could significantly affect the achievement of our goals and objectives are: limited resources, legislative mandates, and budget allocations to any one of the agencies we support.
3. The statutory requirement for the Office of Management & Finance is R.S. 32:406.
4. Objectives and strategies were developed primarily by internal/external assessments, mandatory process priorities, master plans and legislative review and input of proposed plan.
5. Primary persons who will benefit from the plan are the agencies we support as well as the citizens of Louisiana. To provide systems and services that will enable us to make, without bias and based on merit, quality decisions regarding hiring, training and retraining of skilled and capable individuals who are essential to providing cost effective, quality customer services.
6. No true duplication of effort has been identified within the Management & Finance program.
7. See attached Indicator Documentation sheets.
8. All performance indicators will be used to evaluate service provided to budget units we support, streamline processes, analyze cost/benefit and steer future planning of the Department. See attached Indicator Documentation sheets.
9. See Vision 2020 Matrix.
10. Human Resource Policies Beneficial to Women and Families: Public Safety Services grants flexible work schedules, when possible, to accommodate employees with child care or other family issues. The Department has an Employee Assistance Program which provides information and guidance for employees and/or family members. In accordance with Federal Law, the Department supports the Family and Medical Leave Law Act and upholds practices within those guidelines, supporting employees and families.